

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **21 July 2005**, the examiner reviewed claims 1-21. Claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Glass (USPub 2002/0056043, hereinafter “Glass”).

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Independent claims 1, 8, and 15 were rejected as being anticipated by Glass. Applicant respectfully points out that Glass teaches **transmitting biometric data** over a network for authentication against stored biometric data (see Glass Abstract and paragraph [0031]).

In contrast, the present invention **reads biometric data from an identification credential**, wherein the identification credential is an identification card presented by a user, and compares this biometric data locally with a current biometric sample (see page 7, lines 1-20 and page 3, lines 9-11 of the instant application). This is advantageous because it allows the system to operate independently of a network because the biometric data is stored on the identification credential and not at a remote server, thereby reducing the need for fixed assets and communications links. There is nothing within Glass, either explicit or implicit, which suggests reading biometric data from an identification credential wherein the identification credential is an identification card presented by a user, and comparing this biometric data locally with a current biometric sample. Applicant notes that the references cited by the examiner related to receiving an identification credential (paragraphs [0004]-[0005], [0010], [0040], [0063], [0065], and [0079]) all refer to collecting a biometric sample from the user and not reading biometric data from an identification credential.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 8, and 15 to clarify that the present invention reads biometric data from an identification credential presented by a user and compares this biometric data locally with a

current biometric sample. These amendments find support on page 7, lines 1-20 and on page 3, lines 9-11 of the instant application.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 8, and 15 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-7, which depend upon claim 1, claims 9-14, which depend upon claim 8, and claims 16-21, which depend upon claim 15, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By


Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47,615

Date: 1 August 2005

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95616-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665